arXiv:1204.2065v3 [q-fin.GN] 22 Apr 2012

TOEHOLD PURCHASE PROBLEM: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TWO STRATEGIES

TARAS BANAKH AND PAVEL TRISCH

Abstract. Toehold purchase, defined here as purchase of one share in a firm by an investor preparing a tender offer to acquire majority of shares in it, reduces by one the number of shares this investor needs for majority. In the paper we construct mathematical models for the toehold and no-toehold strategies and compare the expected profits of the investor and the probabilities of takeover the firm in both strategies. It turns out that the expected profits of the investor in both strategies coincide. On the other hand, the probability of takeover the firm using the toehold strategy is considerably higher comparing to the no-toehold strategy. In the analysis of the models we apply the apparatus of incomplete Beta functions and some refined bounds for central binomial coefficients.

1. Introduction

This paper is about the toehold purchase problem. In what follows, we take toehold to mean either the number or the fraction of shares owned by an outside investor considering or preparing a tender offer to acquire majority of shares and take over. Right from the start, several explanations are necessary. First, many articles allude to such an investor as “raider”. We prefer to say “outside investor” because translations of the term “raider” tend to have negative connotations in other languages (even in English, raid may mean an attack on the enemy with the use of heavy artillery. If one says “raider” in Slavic languages, many would infer that one is talking about something illegal). In our analysis, there is nothing unethical about what outside investor does. Secondly, by tender offer we mean a proposal made by an investor to shareholders to tender their shares, with the hope to obtain majority of shares and take over. At the time of such an offer, an investor may already own, say, one-share-toehold. In our model the firm is going to be widely held and each shareholder will own one share. Outside investor will make a tender offer to all shareholders if s/he does not own a toehold. An investor will make an offer to all shareholders excluding self when s/he does own a toehold. For our purposes we consider the terms ‘tender offer’ and ‘bid’ as synonyms. Third, a toehold is sometimes taken to mean the maximum possible stake (shareholding) that the outside investor may hold at the time s/he places a tender offer. Here surfaces one of the questions of toehold literature. If an investor is allowed to hold only a certain fraction of shares when s/he wishes to place a tender offer (but not more), would s/he always want to hold this maximum possible stake? If not, why not? Probably with this question in mind, a number of toehold theories look at optimal toeholds in a variety of settings and under variety of assumptions about market structure, ownership structure (how many shares each shareholder owns), information structure or the number of investors (one, two or more); see Grossman, Hart (1980), Bagnoli, Lipman (1988), Singh (1998), Ravid, Spiegel (1999), Goldman, Qian (2005), Ettinger (2009), Chatterjee, John, Yan (2012).

Our approach is different in that we specifically assume that there is only one investor who is considering a tender offer and that if this investor does decide to purchase a toehold then s/he purchases only one share. If there is no toehold, then our assumptions follow the lines of Bagnoli and Lipman (1988). If investor purchases a toehold, then the circumstances of the tender offer are different. The difference does not only lie in the fact that the offer is made to one fewer shareholders. In this case investor’s tender offer might (and generally would) take into account the effect of potential takeover on the worth of a toehold. Our article focuses on working through the details of two settings and making an attempt to interpret the relation between them.

In Section 2 we discuss the approach of Bris (2002) to the toehold purchase problem. Section 3 presents our approach and describes two strategies (no-toehold and toehold) of the outside investor. Our setting is rudimentary in that there are no asymmetries of information, toehold is one share and key to toehold purchase is either yes or no answer. The main results of Section 3 are Theorems 1 and 2. In Theorem 1 we calculate the principal parameters of the non-toehold strategy: the price of a share X_0 suggested by the investor in the tender offer, the probability σ_0 that a shareholder will sell her/his share to the investor, the probability P_0 of takeover the firm, and the expected profit Π_0 of the investor. In Theorem 2 we calculate the respective parameters X_1, σ_1, P_1, Π_1 for the

---

Key words and phrases. Toehold, tender offer, mixed strategy, takeover, beta function.

toehold strategy. Comparing the obtained formulas for these parameters we discovered that both strategies yield the same expected profit $\Pi_1 = \Pi_0$ and the same probability $\sigma_0 = \sigma_1$ that a shareholder will sell her/his share to the investor. On the other hand, the probability P_1 of takeover the firm using the toehold strategy is higher than the corresponding probability P_0 for the no-toehold strategy. This follows from Theorem 3 that yields some lower and upper bounds on the parameters X_i, P_i, Π_i, $i \in \{0, 1\}$, of our models. The proof of Theorem 3 (presented in Appendix) is not trivial and uses the mathematical apparatus of incomplete beta functions and some non-trivial bounds on the central binomial coefficients. In Section 5 we make some mathematical conclusions that follow from the analysis of our models.

2. Some conclusions of Bris

Main argument. Toehold purchase transaction is profitable for an investor (rival) when s/he is able to complete it at a tolerable price. Nevertheless, when such a transaction also sends an advantageous signal to shareholders about potential changes, they might have better opportunities to free-ride on any such changes. In this case, it may be efficient to abstain from a transaction.

Conclusion 1. Bris (2002) contends that toehold purchase decision may be irrelevant when the market perceives that the target is going to be acquired with probability one.

Explanation. Shareholder's response in the post-toehold tender offer in Bris (2002) is as in the world of Grossman and Hart (1980) in which each shareholder is atomistic (words 'widely held', 'infinitesimal' or 'zero-measure' are all appropriate and mean the same thing here) and the investor purchases all remaining shares (excluding the toehold) through the tender offer. Each shareholder requires full expected ex post (i.e. at the completion of the tender offer) worth of the shares to be paid, or s/he would keep his or her share in response to the tender offer.

(a) To make the argument simple, suppose first that there is no asymmetric information, the value of the firm's shares is normalized to 0 under incumbent management, shares are widely held and the outside investor can improve things. Suppose that investor's improvement is quantifiable and in case of takeover the value of the shares will increase to 1. Then, according to Grossman and Hart (1980), in order for takeover to take place in equilibrium, the outside investor would have to pay 1 to each shareholder tendering his or her share in response to the tender offer because conditional on takeover taking place any shareholder who is offered less than 1 would prefer to not tender thus remaining a minority shareholder with his or her stake going up to 1. An equilibrium in which outside investor does offer to pay the full ex post worth of each share to each shareholder and, say, all shareholders tender their shares, cannot be subgame perfect: in the subgame in which outside investor deviates and offers more than 0 but less than 1, there is no equilibrium because in each such subgame if takeover takes place, then it is strongly optimal to not tender but if takeover does not take place then it is strongly optimal to tender. Note that because shareholders are infinitesimal, each one of them does not affect the outcome of the bid. In the (not subgame perfect) equilibrium in which outside investor offers 1, all shareholders tender their shares, outside investor earns zero profit and the firm is surely acquired. Off-the-equilibrium-path, i.e. if offered less than 1, shareholders do not tender their shares.

(b) Bris (2002) adds here, albeit in a setting that is much more advanced from the perspective of informational assumptions and from the perspective of the toehold purchase decision, that outside investor would also have to pay 1 for any toehold purchased prior to the tender offer, assuming that at the time of the toehold purchase the shareholders perceive that the firm is surely going to be acquired.

(c) Explaining now the details of Bris (2002) that are more advanced than described in the previous paragraph from the perspective of informational assumptions and from the perspective of the toehold purchase decision: the outside investor still has to pay full expected ex post worth of the toehold (which is equal to 1 in the previous paragraph), and expected ex post worth for each share (also equal to 1 in the previous paragraph). Toehold is now purchased from the market maker who faces other orders but always has enough shares to match supply and demand. When there is asymmetry of information about quality of changes brought about by the outside investor, then low-quality investor would be making a loss when purchasing the toehold and the shares during the tender stage. Yet, if private benefits accruing to the outside investor in the case of takeover are high enough, then even these low-quality investors would be able to recoup their losses and would still be willing to bid. The market perceives this and the firm is surely taken over. Toehold purchase would be occurring at the same price as purchase of shares tendered by shareholders in response to the tender offer. An investor who would bring about good changes or avoid major mistakes may, on the other hand, gain if a toehold is worth more after the completion of a bid.

Conclusion 2. Bris (2002) contends that toehold purchase decision may be relevant when there is asymmetric information.

(a) In response to any tender offer, with or without a toehold, shareholders are laboriously calculating potential gains of the outside investor. They want to know, conditional on the fact that the bid has been submitted (that is to say, net gains inclusive of the private benefits associated with takeover must have been positive), what the expected ex post worth of the shares would be. When there is asymmetric information about firm value conditional on takeover, outside investor's gains are probabilistic from shareholders' perspective. The outside investor will submit the bid only if his or her pre-determined gains (s/he know what these gains are), inclusive of private benefits accruing in the case of takeover, are greater than what s/he has to pay in the post-toehold trade tender. That in turn directly depends on his or her toehold: bigger toehold means lower fraction of the firm needs to be purchased in the tender and so less money to be paid for these shares. So from this perspective bigger toehold, if at all, will make the bid only more likely because lower quality bidders would be willing to bid if they have large enough toehold. If low-quality bidders are added to the set of those who are willing to participate in the bid, expected ex post worth of shares from the perspective of shareholders will go down, so that a smaller offer would do. That is to say, higher toehold results in lower bid.

(b) Continuing preceding subsection (a), if private benefits accruing to the outside investor in the case of takeover are lower, then low-quality investors would not be able to recoup their losses from paying full expected ex post worth of the toehold and would not be willing to bid. Consequently, the firm may not be acquired.

The next section reveals our alternative approach which, to repeat ourselves, will assume away any informational asymmetries and in which (unlike in the discussion above) higher toehold would require higher bid in the post-toehold trade. Of primary interest to us is how the probability conditional on toehold purchase (in Bris (2002), conditional on toehold purchase, the bid takes place with probability 1) relates to the probability conditional on not purchasing a toehold. We are driving at a conclusion that higher probability of takeover should not alone decide investor's judgment in favor of taking significant steps that increase that probability.

3. MODELS

We assume that a firm has $2n+1$ shareholders. Each shareholder owns one share. The worth of each share, if the firm continues to be run by incumbent management, is normalized to 0. There is also an outside investor **B** who is considering takeover bid. If investor takes over, the value of each share is increased to 1.

Now we consider two strategies of the investor **B** who is willing to take over the firm buying a majority of shares.

0. The first strategy will be referred to as the *no-toehold strategy* and its parameters will be labeled by the subscript 0. Following the no-toehold strategy, the investor **B** makes a tender offer to all $2n+1$ shareholders suggesting a price X for each share. Shareholders decide independently whether to accept or to reject the tender offer. They may use mixed strategies, i.e. accept the offer with certain probability σ. Simple majority of $n+1$ shares is necessary for takeover. Tender offer is unconditional in the sense that if less than n shareholder accept the tender offer, then **B** has to purchase shares from those shareholders who accepted the offer, even though in that case **B** becomes minority shareholder, the worth of each share value remains at 0 and such purchase is ex post unprofitable for **B** as long as $X>0$.

Suppose shareholders use symmetric mixed strategies, in which in response to tender offer X all of them accept the tender offer with probability σ $(0<\sigma<1)$ and reject it with probability $(1-\sigma)$. For the pair (X,σ) to be equilibrial, each shareholder has to be indifferent between tendering and not tendering her share, or otherwise she would not use mixing strategy. If she tenders, she ends up with X, and if she does not, her unsold stake is worth more than 0 if among remaining $2n$ shareholders at least $n+1$ shareholders tender their shares. That happens with probability $\sum_{k=n+1}^{2n}\binom{2n}{k}\sigma^k(1-\sigma)^{2n-k}$. In that case the firm is taken over. A shareholder who did not tender her share remains a minority shareholder who "free-rides" on investor's improvement in firm value from 0 to 1. So the pair (X,σ) can be a suspect for a symmetric mixed strategy equilibrium only if

$$X=\sum_{k=n+1}^{2n}\binom{2n}{k}\sigma^k(1-\sigma)^{2n-k}. \tag{1}$$

Here by

$$\binom{n}{k} = \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!}$$

we denote the binomial coefficients.

The investor's expected profit Π is calculated using three variables: the number of tendered shares, probability that exactly that many shares are tendered and the share value:

$$\Pi = (0-X)\sum_{k=1}^{n} k\binom{2n+1}{k}\sigma^k(1-\sigma)^{2n+1-k} + (1-X)\sum_{k=n+1}^{2n+1} k\binom{2n+1}{k}\sigma^k(1-\sigma)^{2n+1-k}.$$

After a suitable rearrangement and substituting for X the sum (1) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi &= \sum_{k=n+1}^{2n+1} k\binom{2n+1}{k}\sigma^k(1-\sigma)^{2n+1-k} - X\sum_{k=1}^{2n+1} k\binom{2n+1}{k}\sigma^k(1-\sigma)^{2n+1-k} = \\
&= (2n+1)\sum_{k=n+1}^{2n+1} \binom{2n}{k-1}\sigma^k(1-\sigma)^{2n+1-k} - X(2n+1)\sum_{k=1}^{2n+1} \binom{2n}{k-1}\sigma^k(1-\sigma)^{2n+1-k} = \\
&= (2n+1)\sum_{k=n}^{2n} \binom{2n}{k}\sigma^{k+1}(1-\sigma)^{2n-k} - X(2n+1)\sigma\sum_{k=0}^{2n} \binom{2n}{k}\sigma^k(1-\sigma)^{2n-k} = \\
&= (2n+1)\sum_{k=n}^{2n} \binom{2n}{k}\sigma^{k+1}(1-\sigma)^{2n-k} - (2n+1)\sigma X(\sigma+(1-\sigma))^{2n} = \\
&= (2n+1)\sum_{k=n}^{2n} \binom{2n}{k}\sigma^{k+1}(1-\sigma)^{2n-k} - (2n+1)\sigma X = \\
&= (2n+1)\sum_{k=n}^{2n} \binom{2n}{k}\sigma^{k+1}(1-\sigma)^{2n-k} - (2n+1)\sigma\sum_{k=n+1}^{2n} \binom{2n}{k}\sigma^{k}(1-\sigma)^{2n-k} = \\
&= (2n+1)\sum_{k=n}^{2n} \binom{2n}{k}\sigma^{k+1}(1-\sigma)^{2n-k} - (2n+1)\sum_{k=n+1}^{2n} \binom{2n}{k}\sigma^{k+1}(1-\sigma)^{2n-k} = \\
&= (2n+1)\binom{2n}{n}\sigma^{n+1}(1-\sigma)^n.
\end{aligned}$$

The maximal value

$$\Pi_0 = (2n+1)\binom{2n}{n}\sigma_0^{n+1}(1-\sigma_0)^n = \binom{2n}{n}\frac{(n+1)^{n+1}n^n}{(2n+1)^{2n}}$$

of the profit of the investor is attained for the probability

$$\sigma_0 = \frac{n+1}{2n+1}$$

that corresponds to the price of a share

$$X_0 = \sum_{k=n+1}^{2n} \binom{2n}{k}\sigma_0^k(1-\sigma_0)^{2n-k} = \sum_{k=n+1}^{2n} \binom{2n}{k}\frac{(n+1)^k n^{2n-k}}{(2n+1)^{2n}}.$$

In this situation the probability of takeover the firm by the investor equals

$$P_0 = \sum_{k=n+1}^{2n+1} \binom{2n+1}{k}\sigma_0^k(1-\sigma_0)^{2n+1-k} = \sum_{k=n+1}^{2n+1} \binom{2n+1}{k}\frac{(n+1)^k n^{2n+1-k}}{(2n+1)^{2n+1}}.$$

The no-toehold strategy will be denoted by $\mathcal{S}_0$. We summarize our description of this strategy in the following:

Theorem 1. *If the investor uses the no-toehold strategy $\mathcal{S}_0$ to take over a firm with $(2n+1)$ shareholders, then he should offer the price*

$$X_0 = \sum_{k=n+1}^{2n} \tbinom{2n}{k} \frac{(n+1)^k n^{2n-k}}{(2n+1)^{2n}}$$

for a share in the tender offer and can expect to take over the firm with probability

$$P_0 = \sum_{k=n+1}^{2n+1} \tbinom{2n+1}{k} \frac{(n+1)^k n^{2n+1-k}}{(2n+1)^{2n+1}}$$

and expect for the profit

$$\Pi_0 = \tbinom{2n}{n} \frac{(n+1)^{n+1} n^n}{(2n+1)^{2n}}.$$

If the shareholders tend to maximize their profits then they will sell their shares to the investor with probability

$$\sigma_0 = \frac{n+1}{2n+1}.$$

1. Now we consider a more complex strategy $\mathcal{S}_1$ called the *toehold strategy.* Following this strategy the investor **B** first tries to purchase one-share toehold from a shareholder **A** who is aware that **B** is about to launch a tender offer to acquire majority of shares suggesting the price X_0 for a share. We assume that **A** is the only shareholder from whom **B** is able to purchase a toehold, and **A** agrees to sell her share to the investor **B** for the price X_0.

After buying the toehold from the shareholder **A**, the investor announces a post-toehold tender offer to the remaining $2n$ shareholders, offering a price X_1 for a share. If σ_1 is the probability that a shareholder will tender her share for that price, then the equilibrium will occur if

$$X_1 = \sum_{k=n}^{2n-1} \tbinom{2n-1}{k} \sigma_1^k (1-\sigma_1)^{2n-1-k},$$

which is equal to the probability that among $2n-1$ shareholders at least n will sell their shares.

The probability of takeover the firm in the post toehold tender is equal to

$$P_1 = \sum_{k=n}^{2n} \tbinom{2n}{k} \sigma_1^k (1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k}$$

and the expected profit Π_1 of the investor for the toehold strategy is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_1 &= (-X_0 + 1 \cdot P_1) + (0 - X_1) \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} k \tbinom{2n}{k} \sigma_1^k (1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k} + (1 - X_1) \sum_{k=n}^{2n} k \tbinom{2n}{k} \sigma_1^k (1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k} = \\
&= (-X_0 + P_1) - X_1 2n\sigma_1 \sum_{k=1}^{2n} \tbinom{2n-1}{k-1} \sigma_1^{k-1} (1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k} + 2n\sigma_1 \sum_{k=n}^{2n} \tbinom{2n-1}{k-1} \sigma_1^{k-1} (1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k} = \\
&= (-X_0 + P_1) - 2n\sigma_1 X_1 \sum_{k=0}^{2n-1} \tbinom{2n-1}{k} \sigma_1^k (1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k-1} + 2n\sigma_1 \sum_{k=n-1}^{2n-1} \tbinom{2n-1}{k} \sigma_1^k (1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k-1} = \\
&= (-X_0 + P_1) - 2n\sigma_1 X_1 (\sigma_1 + (1-\sigma_1))^{2n-1} + 2n\sigma_1 \sum_{k=n-1}^{2n-1} \tbinom{2n-1}{k} \sigma_1^k (1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k-1} = \\
&= (-X_0 + P_1) - 2n\sigma_1 \sum_{k=n}^{2n-1} \tbinom{2n-1}{k} \sigma_1^k (1-\sigma_1)^{2n-1-k} + 2n\sigma_1 \sum_{k=n-1}^{2n-1} \tbinom{2n-1}{k} \sigma_1^k (1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k-1} = \\
&= (-X_0 + P_1) + 2n \tbinom{2n-1}{n-1} \sigma_1^n (1-\sigma_1)^n = (-X_0 + P_1) + n \tbinom{2n}{n} \sigma_1^n (1-\sigma_1)^n = \\
&= -X_0 + \sum_{k=n}^{2n} \tbinom{2n}{k} \sigma_1^k (1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k} + n \tbinom{2n}{n} \sigma_1^n (1-\sigma_1)^n.
\end{aligned}$$

To find the maximal value of the expected profit Π_1, consider the derivative

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\Pi_1}{d\sigma_1} &= \frac{d}{d\sigma_1}\sigma_1^{2n} + \frac{d}{d\sigma_1}\sum_{k=n}^{2n-1}\tbinom{2n}{k}\sigma_1^k(1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k} + \frac{d}{d\sigma_1}n\tbinom{2n}{n}\sigma_1^n(1-\sigma_1)^n = \\
&= 2n\sigma_1^{2n-1} + \sum_{k=n}^{2n-1}\tbinom{2n}{k}\big(k\sigma_1^{k-1}(1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k} - (2n-k)\sigma_1^k(1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k-1}\big) + n^2\tbinom{2n}{n}(\sigma_1-\sigma_1^2)^{n-1}(1-2\sigma_1) = \\
&= \sum_{k=n}^{2n} 2n\tbinom{2n-1}{k-1}\sigma_1^{k-1}(1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k} - \sum_{k=n}^{2n-1} 2n\tbinom{2n-1}{k}\sigma_1^k(1-\sigma_1)^{2n-1-k} + n^2\tbinom{2n}{n}(\sigma_1-\sigma_1^2)^{n-1}(1-2\sigma_1) = \\
&= \sum_{k=n-1}^{2n-1} 2n\tbinom{2n-1}{k}\sigma_1^k(1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k-1} - \sum_{k=n}^{2n-1} 2n\tbinom{2n-1}{k}\sigma_1^k(1-\sigma_1)^{2n-1-k} + n^2\tbinom{2n}{n}(\sigma_1-\sigma_1^2)^{n-1}(1-2\sigma_1) = \\
&= 2n\tbinom{2n-1}{n-1}\sigma_1^{n-1}(1-\sigma_1)^n + n^2\tbinom{2n}{n}(\sigma_1-\sigma_1^2)^{n-1}(1-2\sigma_1) = \\
&= n\tbinom{2n}{n}(\sigma_1-\sigma_1^2)^{n-1}(1-\sigma_1) + n^2\tbinom{2n}{n}(\sigma_1-\sigma_1^2)^{n-1}(1-2\sigma_1) = n\tbinom{2n}{n}(\sigma_1-\sigma_1^2)^{n-1}\big(1-\sigma_1+n(1-2\sigma_1)\big)
\end{aligned}$$

and observe that it is equal to zero at $\sigma_1 = \frac{n+1}{2n+1} = \sigma_0$. So, for $\sigma_1 = \sigma_0 = \frac{n+1}{2n+1}$ the expected profit Π_1 attains its maximal value

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_1 &= -X_0 + \sum_{k=n}^{2n}\tbinom{2n}{k}\sigma_1^k(1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k} + n\tbinom{2n}{n}\sigma_1^n(1-\sigma_1)^n = \\
&= -\sum_{k=n+1}^{2n}\tbinom{2n}{k}\sigma_0^k(1-\sigma_0)^{2n-k} + \sum_{k=n}^{2n}\tbinom{2n}{k}\sigma_1^k(1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k} + n\tbinom{2n}{n}\sigma_1^n(1-\sigma_1)^n = \\
&= \tbinom{2n}{n}\sigma_1^n(1-\sigma_1)^n + n\tbinom{2n}{n}\sigma_1^n(1-\sigma_1)^n = (n+1)\tbinom{2n}{n}\frac{(n+1)^n n^n}{(2n+1)^2n} = \Pi_0.
\end{aligned}$$

The above discussion can be summed up in:

Theorem 2. *If the investor follows the toehold strategy $\mathcal{S}_1$, then with probability 1 he can buy a toehold from the shareholder* **A** *offering a price $X_0 + 0$ for her share and then in the post-toehold offer he should offer the price*

$$X_1 = \sum_{k=n}^{2n-1}\tbinom{2n-1}{k}\frac{(n+1)^k n^{2n-1-k}}{(2n+1)^{2n-1}}$$

for a share, in which case the shareholders will sell their shares with probability

$$\sigma_1 = \frac{n+1}{2n+1} = \sigma_0,$$

the investor can takeover the firm with probability

$$P_1 = \sum_{k=n}^{2n}\tbinom{2n}{k}\frac{(n+1)^k n^{2n-k}}{(2n+1)^{2n}}$$

and can expect for the profit

$$\Pi_1 = \tbinom{2n}{n}\frac{(n+1)^{n+1}n^n}{(2n+1)^{2n}} = \Pi_0.$$

As we see from Theorems 1 and 2, the no-toehold and toehold strategies yield the same profit $\Pi_0 = \Pi_1$ and the same probability $\sigma_0 = \sigma_1 = \frac{n+1}{2n+1}$ of selling their shares by the shareholders in the tender offers. On the other hand, the prices for a share and the probabilities P_0 and P_1 of takeover the firm are different for these two strategies. The precise estimate of the differences $P_1 - P_0$ and $X_1 - X_0$ will be given in Corollary 1. Now, let us consider a simple example.

3.1. **A firm with 3 shareholders.** In case of 3-shareholders (which corresponds to $n = 1$) the values of all parameters from Theorems 1 and 2 can be easily calculated:

- $\sigma_0 = \frac{2}{3}$ is the probability that shareholders will sell their shares to the investor for the price:
- $X_0 = \frac{4}{9}$ suggested by the investor in the no-toehold strategy,
- $P_0 = \frac{20}{27}$ is the probability of taking over the firm in the no-toehold strategy;
- $\Pi_0 = \frac{8}{9}$ is the expected profit of the investor in the no-toehold strategy;
- $\sigma_1 = \frac{2}{3}$ is the probability that a shareholder will tender her share to the investor for the price:
- $X_1 = \frac{2}{3}$ suggested by the investor in the post-toehold tender offer,
- $P_1 = \frac{8}{9}$ is the probability of taking over the firm in the toehold strategy,
- $\Pi_1 = \frac{8}{9}$ is the expected profit of the investor in the toehold strategy.

Looking at these data, we see that both strategies yield the same profit but the toehold strategy is much better than the no-toehold strategy in the sense of probability of takeover the firm.

It turns out that the same situation happens for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, see Corollary 1 below. In this corollary we shall prove that the difference $P_1 - P_0$ of probabilities for the toehold and no-toehold strategies is strictly positive and has order $P_1 - P_0 \approx \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi n}}$.

4. Upper and lower bounds for parameters of the model

In this section we present the lower and upper bounds for the parameters of our models that appear in Theorem 2. Our main result is the following theorem that will be proved in Section 9.

Theorem 3. *The parameters of the models lie in the following intervals:*

$$X_0\colon\quad \frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(-\frac{1}{6n}-\frac{1}{64n^2}\Big) < X_0 < \frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(-\frac{1}{6n}+\frac{5}{24n^2}\Big),$$

$$X_1\colon\quad \frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{5}{16n}+\frac{1}{48n^2}\Big) < X_1 < \frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{5}{16n}+\frac{1}{12n^2}\Big),$$

$$P_0\colon\quad \frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{5}{48n}+\frac{1}{16n^2}\Big) < P_0 < \frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{5}{48n}+\frac{6}{16n^2}\Big),$$

$$P_1\colon\quad \frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1-\frac{13}{24n}+\frac{3}{16n^2}\Big) < P_1 < \frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1-\frac{13}{24n}+\frac{4}{16n^2}\Big),$$

$$\Pi_0,\Pi_1\colon\quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(n+\frac{5}{8}-\frac{1}{4n}\Big) < \Pi_0 = \Pi_1 < \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(n+\frac{5}{8}-\frac{1}{24n}+\frac{1}{3n^2}\Big).$$

Looking at the bounds for the probabilities P_0, P_1 and the prices X_0, X_1 we can notice that $P_0 < P_1$ and $X_0 < X_1$. An estimation of the differences $P_1 - P_0$ and $X_1 - X_0$ is given in the following corollary of Theorem 3.

Corollary 1.

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\cdot\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{31}{48n}-\frac{3}{16n^2}\Big) < P_1 - P_0 < \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\cdot\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{31}{48n}+\frac{3}{16n^2}\Big)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\cdot\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{7}{48n}-\frac{3}{16n^2}\Big) < X_1 - X_0 < \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\cdot\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{7}{48n}+\frac{1}{24n^2}\Big)$$

The difference $X_1 - X_0 \approx \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi n}}$ can be interpreted as the price for the information that the investor possesses a toehold.

5. Conclusion

The analysis of our models witnesses that both strategies (toehold and no toehold) of taking over the firm with $2n+1$ shareholds yield the same profit $\Pi_0 = \Pi_1 \approx \sqrt{\frac{n}{\pi}}$ but the probability $P_1 \approx \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}$ of taking over for the toehold strategy is higher than the corresponding probability $P_0 \approx \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi n}}$ for the no-toehold strategy. Also the equilibrium price $X_1 \approx \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi n}}$ for a share offered by the investor in the tender offer announced after buying a toehold is higher that the corresponding price $X_0 \approx \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{6n\sqrt{\pi n}}$ in the tender offer without toehold. The difference $X_1 - X_0 \approx \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi n}}$ can be interpreted as the price for the information that the investor possesses a toehold.

References

[1] Bagnoli M., Lipman B. (1988): Successful takeovers without exclusion, *The Review of Financial Studies,* 1, no.1, pp. 89–110.

[2] Bagnoli M., Lipman B. (1996): Stock price manipulation through takeover bids, *Rand Journal of Economics*, 27, no.1, 124–147.

[3] Betton S., Eckbo B.E., Thorburn K.S. (2009): Merger negotiations and the toehold puzzle, *Journal of Financial Economics,* 91, no.2, 158–178.

[4] Bris A. (2002): Toeholds, takeover premium and the probability of being acquired, *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 8, no.3, 227–253.

[5] Chatterjee S., John K., Yan A. (2012): Takeovers and divergence of investor opinion, *The Review of Financial Studies*, 25, no.1, 227–277.

[6] Dutka J. (1981): The incomplete beta function – a historical profile, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, 24, 11–29.

[7] Ettinger D. (2009): Takeover contests, toeholds and deterrence, *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 111, no.1, 103–124.

[8] Goldman E., Qian J. (2005): Optimal toeholds in takeover contests, *Journal of Financial Economics* 77, no.2, 321–346.

[9] Grossman S., Hart O. (1980): Takeover bids, the free rider problem, and the theory of the corporation, *The Bell Journal of Economics*, 11, no.1, 42–64.

[10] Maria A. (1965): A remark on Stirling's formula, *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 72, 1096–1098.

[11] Ravid S.A., Spiegel M. (1999): Toehold Strategies, takeover laws and rival bidders, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 23, no.8, 1219–1242.

[12] Robbins, H. (1955): A remark on Stirling's formula, *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 62, 26–29.

[13] Singh R. (1998): Takeover bidding with toeholds: the case of the owners curse, *The Review of Financial Studies*, 11, no. 4, 679–704.

Appendix

6. Explicit analytic expressions for the parameters of the models

For deriving the lower and upper bounds presented in Theorem 3 we shall transform the binomial sums appearing in the expressions of the parameters of our models and obtain precise analytic formulas for these parameters, after which we shall evaluate them using some bounds on central binomial coefficients and simple bounds giving by Taylor series. Our principal tool in finding explicit analytic expressions for the parameters of the model is use of incomplete beta functions.

By definition, the *beta function* is the function

$$B(a,b)=\int_0^1 t^{a-1}(1-t)^{b-1}dt$$

depending on two real positive parameters a,b. For fixed a,b the function

$$B_x(a,b)=\int_0^x t^{a-1}(1-t)^{b-1}dt$$

on the variable $x\in[0,1]$ is called the *incomplete beta function.* A remarkable property of the incomplete beta function is that for positive integer numbers a,b its value is proportional to a tail of the binomial series:

$$\sum_{k=a}^{a+b-1}\binom{a+b-1}{k}x^k(1-x)^{a+b-1-k}=a\binom{a+b-1}{a}B_x(a,b)=a\binom{a+b-1}{a}\int_0^x t^{a-1}(1-t)^{b-1}dt \tag{2}$$

This equality plays a fundamental role in our subsequent arguments and will be referred to as the *beta-equality.* For the proof of the beta-equality and other information on (incomplete) beta functions, we refer the reader to the survey paper of Dutka (1981).

Beta functions will be used in the proof of the following theorem that gives explicit analytic formulas for the parameters describing the no-toehold and toehold strategies.

Theorem 4. *The parameters of the models can be calculated by the following formulas:*

1. *The price* $X_0=\sum_{k=n+1}^{2n}\binom{2n}{k}\frac{(n+1)^k n^{2n-k}}{(2n+1)^{2n}}$ *suggested by the investor in the no-toehold strategy can be found by the formula*

$$X_0=\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2^{2n+1}}\binom{2n}{n}\Big(1-\frac{1}{(2n+1)^2}\Big)^n+\frac{n}{2^{2n}}\binom{2n}{n}\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}}(1-t^2)^{n-1}dt.$$

2. *The probability* $P_0=\sum_{k=n+1}^{2n+1}\binom{2n+1}{k}\frac{(n+1)^k n^{2n+1-k}}{(2n+1)^{2n+1}}$ *of taking over the firm in the no-toehold strategy can be found as*

$$P_0=\frac{1}{2}+\frac{(2n+1)}{2^{2n+1}}\binom{2n}{n}\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}}(1-t^2)^n dt.$$

3. *The expected profits* $\Pi_0=\Pi_1=\binom{2n}{n}\frac{n^n(n+1)^{n+1}}{(2n+1)^{2n}}$ *of the investor can be found by*

$$\Pi_0=\Pi_1=\frac{(n+1)}{2^{2n}}\binom{2n}{n}\Big(1-\frac{1}{(2n+1)^2}\Big)^n.$$

4. *The probability* $P_1=\sum_{k=n}^{2n}\binom{2n}{k}\frac{(n+1)^k n^{2n-k}}{(2n+1)^{2n}}$ *of takeover the firm in the post-toehold strategy is equal to*

$$P_1=\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2^{2n+1}}\binom{2n}{n}\Big(1-\frac{1}{(2n+1)^2}\Big)^n+\frac{n}{2^{2n}}\binom{2n}{n}\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}}(1-t^2)^{n-1}dt.$$

5. *The price* $X_1=\sum_{k=n}^{2n-1}\binom{2n-1}{k}\frac{(n+1)^k n^{2n-1-k}}{(2n+1)^{2n-1}}$ *for a share offered by the investor in the post-toehold tender offer can be calculated as*

$$X_1=\frac{1}{2}+\frac{n}{2^{2n}}\binom{2n}{n}\int_0^{\frac{1}{(2n+1)}}(1-t^2)^{n-1}dt.$$

Proof. 1. To deduce the formula for the price X_0, we use the beta-equality (2) with parameters $a = n+1$ and $b = n$. In this case we get the equality

$$\sum_{k=n+1}^{2n}\tbinom{2n}{k}x^k(1-x)^{2n-k}=(n+1)\tbinom{2n}{n+1}\int_0^x t^n(1-t)^{n-1}dt=n\tbinom{2n}{n}\int_0^x t^n(1-t)^{n-1}dt. \tag{3}$$

For $x=\frac12$, this equality turns into:

$$n\tbinom{2n}{n}\int_0^{\frac12} t^n(1-t)^{n-1}=\sum_{k=n+1}^{2n}\tbinom{2n}{k}\frac{1}{2^{2n}}=\frac12\Big(-\tbinom{2n}{n}\frac{1}{2^{2n}}+\sum_{k=0}^{2}n\tbinom{2n}{n}\frac{1}{2^{2n}}\Big)=\frac12\Big(1-\tbinom{2n}{n}\frac{1}{2^{2n}}\Big)$$

because

$$\sum_{k=0}^{2n}\tbinom{2n}{n}\frac{1}{2^{2n}}=\Big(\frac12+\frac12\Big)^n=1.$$

Then (3) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=n+1}^{2n}\tbinom{2n}{k}x^k(1-x)^{2n-k}&=n\tbinom{2n}{n}\Big(\int_0^{1/2}t^n(1-t)^{n-1}dt+\int_{1/2}^x t^n(1-t)^{n-1}dt\Big)=\\
&=\frac12-\frac{1}{2^{2n+1}}\tbinom{2n}{n}+n\tbinom{2n}{n}\int_0^{x-1/2}(\tfrac12+u)^n(\tfrac12-u)^{n-1}du=\\
&=\frac12-\frac{1}{2^{2n+1}}\tbinom{2n}{n}+n\tbinom{2n}{n}\int_0^{x-1/2}(\tfrac12+u)(\tfrac14-u^2)^{n-1}du=\\
&=\frac12-\frac{1}{2^{2n+1}}\tbinom{2n}{n}+n\tbinom{2n}{n}\Big(\frac12\int_0^{x-1/2}(\tfrac14-u^2)^{n-1}du-\frac12\int_0^{x-1/2}(\tfrac14-u^2)^{n-1}d(\tfrac14-u^2)\Big)=\\
&=\frac12-\frac{1}{2^{2n+1}}\tbinom{2n}{n}+\frac{n}{2^{2n-1}}\tbinom{2n}{n}\int_0^{x-1/2}(1-(2u)^2)^{n-1}du-\frac{\binom{2n}{n}}{2}\big((x-x^2)^n-\tfrac{1}{4^n}\big)=\\
&=\frac12+\frac{n}{2^{2n}}\tbinom{2n}{n}\int_0^{2x-1}(1-t^2)^{n-1}dt-\frac12\tbinom{2n}{n}x^n(1-x)^n.
\end{aligned}$$

For $x=\sigma_0=\frac12+\frac{1}{2(2n+1)}$ the latter formula yields the required formula for the price X_0:

$$X_0=\sum_{k=n+1}^{2n}\tbinom{2n}{k}\sigma_0^k(1-\sigma_0)^{2n-k}=\frac12-\frac{1}{2^{2n+1}}\tbinom{2n}{n}\Big(1-\frac{1}{(2n+1)^2}\Big)^n+\frac{n}{2^{2n}}\tbinom{2n}{n}\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}}(1-t^2)^{n-1}dt.$$

2. By analogy we deduce the formula for the probability $P_0=\sum_{k=n+1}^{2n+1}\binom{2n+1}{k}\frac{(n+1)^k n^{2n+1-k}}{(2n+1)^{2n+1}}$ of takeover the firm in the no-toehold strategy. Writing down the beta-equality (2) for the parameters $a=n+1$ and $b=n+1$, we get

$$\sum_{k=n+1}^{2n+1}\tbinom{2n+1}{k}x^k(1-x)^{2n+1-k}=(n+1)\tbinom{2n+1}{n+1}\int_0^x t^n(1-t)^n dt. \tag{4}$$

For $x=\frac12$, this equality turns into:

$$(n+1)\tbinom{2n+1}{n+1}\int_0^{\frac12}t^n(1-t)^n=\sum_{k=n+1}^{2n+1}\tbinom{2n+1}{k}\frac{1}{2^{2n+1}}=\frac12.$$

After suitable rearrangements, for $x=\sigma_0=\frac{n+1}{2n+1}$ the equality (4) transforms into the desired equality:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_0=\sum_{k=n+1}^{2n+1}\tbinom{2n+1}{k}x^k(1-x)^{2n+1-k}&=(n+1)\tbinom{2n+1}{n+1}\Big(\int_0^{1/2}t^n(1-t)^n dt+\int_{1/2}^x t^n(1-t)^n dt\Big)=\\
&=\frac12+(n+1)\tbinom{2n+1}{n+1}\int_0^{x-1/2}(\tfrac12+u)^n(\tfrac12-u)^n du=\\
&=\frac12+\frac{(2n+1)}{2^{2n+1}}\tbinom{2n}{n}\int_0^{2x-1}(1-t^2)^n dt=\frac12+\frac{(2n+1)}{2^{2n+1}}\tbinom{2n}{n}\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}}(1-t^2)^n dt.
\end{aligned}$$

3. The formula for the profits $\Pi_0 = \Pi_1 = \binom{2n}{n}\frac{n^n(n+1)^{n+1}}{(2n+1)^{2n}}$ follows from the observation that

$$\frac{n^2+n}{(2n+1)^2} = \frac{1}{4}\Big(1 - \frac{1}{(2n+1)^2}\Big).$$

4. Taking into account that $\sigma_1 = \sigma_0 = \frac{n+1}{2n+1}$ and looking at the formula for X_0 proved in Theorem 4(1), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
P_1 &= \sum_{k=n}^{2n} \tbinom{2n}{k}\sigma_1^k(1-\sigma_1)^{2n-k} = \tbinom{2n}{n}\sigma_1^n(1-\sigma_1)^n + X_0 = \\
&= \frac{1}{2^{2n}}\tbinom{2n}{n}\Big(1 - \frac{1}{(2n+1)^2}\Big)^n + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^{2n+1}}\tbinom{2n}{n}\Big(1 - \frac{1}{(2n+1)^2}\Big)^n + \frac{n}{2^{2n}}\tbinom{2n}{n}\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}}(1-t^2)^{n-1}dt = \\
&= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2^{2n+1}}\tbinom{2n}{n}\Big(1 - \frac{1}{(2n+1)^2}\Big)^n + \frac{n}{2^{2n}}\tbinom{2n}{n}\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}}(1-t^2)^{n-1}dt.
\end{aligned}$$

5. The beta-equation (2) written for $a = n$ and $b = n$ yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
X_1 &= \sum_{k=n}^{2n-1} \tbinom{2n-1}{k}\sigma_1^k(1-\sigma_1)^{2n-1-k} = n\tbinom{2n-1}{n}\int_0^{\sigma_1} t^{n-1}(1-t)^{n-1}dt = \\
&= n\tbinom{2n-1}{n}\int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{n-1}(1-t)^{n-1}dt + n\tbinom{2n-1}{n}\int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\sigma_1-\frac{1}{2}} t^{n-1}(1-t)^{n-1}dt = \\
&= \sum_{k=n}^{2n-1} \tbinom{2n-1}{k}\frac{1}{2^{2n-1}} + n\tbinom{2n-1}{n}\int_0^{\frac{1}{2(2n+1)}} (\tfrac{1}{2}+u)^{n-1}(\tfrac{1}{2}-u)^{n-1}du = \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=0}^{2n-1} \tbinom{2n-1}{k}\frac{1}{2^{2n-1}} + \frac{n}{2}\tbinom{2n}{n}\int_0^{\frac{1}{2(2n+1)}} (\tfrac{1}{4}-u^2)^{n-1}du = \\
&= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{n}{2^{2n-1}}\tbinom{2n}{n}\int_0^{\frac{1}{2(2n+1)}} (1-4u^2)^{n-1}du = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{n}{2^{2n}}\tbinom{2n}{n}\int_0^{\frac{1}{(2n+1)}} (1-t^2)^{n-1}dt.
\end{aligned}$$

□

7. SOME LOWER AND UPPER BOUNDS

In this section we shall prove some lower and upper bounds for subformulas composing the formulas from Theorem 4. We shall need the following known inequalities, which can be easily proved by calculating the corresponding derivatives.

Lemma 1. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a real number $x > 0$ the following inequalities hold:*

(1) $1 - x < 1 - x + \frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{1}{6}x^3 < e^{-x} < 1 - x + \frac{1}{2}x^2$;
(2) $1 - x < \frac{1}{1+x} < 1 - x + x^2$;
(3) $1 - nx < (1-x)^n < 1 - nx + \frac{n(n-1)}{2}x^2$.

These lower and upper bounds will be used in the proof of the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *The following lower and upper bound hold for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$:*

(1) $$\frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{4n^2} + \frac{1}{12n^3} < \frac{1}{2n+1} < \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{4n^2} + \frac{1}{8n^3}.$$
(2) $$1 - \frac{1}{4n} + \frac{1}{8n^2} < \Big(1 - \frac{1}{(2n+1)^2}\Big)^n < 1 - \frac{1}{4n} + \frac{9}{32n^2};$$
(3) $$\frac{1}{2n} - \frac{7}{24n^2} + \frac{11}{48n^3} < \int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}}(1-t^2)^n dt < \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{7}{24n^2} + \frac{18}{48n^3};$$
(4) $$\frac{1}{2n} - \frac{7}{24n^2} + \frac{5}{48n^3} < \int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}}(1-t^2)^{n-1} dt < \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{7}{24n^2} + \frac{12}{48n^3};$$

Proof. 1. First we transform the fraction $\frac{1}{2n+1}$ as follows:

$$\frac{1}{2n+1}=\frac{8n^3}{8n^3(2n+1)}=\frac{(2n+1)^3-3(2n+1)^2+3(2n+1)-1}{8n^3(2n+1)}=\frac{(2n+1)^2}{8n^3}-\frac{3(2n+1)}{8n^3}+\frac{3}{8n^3}-\frac{1}{8n^3(2n+1)}=$$
$$=\frac{1}{2n}+\frac{1}{2n^2}+\frac{1}{8n^3}-\frac{3}{4n^2}-\frac{3}{8n^3}+\frac{3}{8n^3}-\frac{1}{8n^3(2n+1)}=\frac{1}{2n}-\frac{1}{4n^2}+\frac{1}{8n^3}-\frac{1}{8n^3(2n+1)}.$$

Taking into account that $(2n+1)\geq 3$, we get the necessary lower and upper bounds on the fraction $\frac{1}{2n+1}$:

$$\frac{1}{2n}-\frac{1}{4n^2}+\frac{1}{12n^3}\leq\frac{1}{2n}-\frac{1}{4n^2}+\frac{1}{8n^3}-\frac{1}{8n^3(2n+1)}=\frac{1}{(2n+1)}<\frac{1}{2n}-\frac{1}{4n^2}+\frac{1}{8n^3}.$$

2. To evaluate the power $\big(1-\frac{1}{(2n+1)^2}\big)^n$ we shall use Lemma 1(3). The lower bound can be obtained as follows:

$$\Big(1-\frac{1}{(2n+1)^2}\Big)^n>1-\frac{n}{(2n+1)^2}=1-\frac{8n^3}{8n^2(2n+1)^2}=1-\frac{(2n+1)^3-3(2n+1)^2+3(2n+1)-1}{8n^2(2n+1)^2}=$$
$$=1-\frac{1}{4n}+\frac{1}{4n^2}-\frac{3}{8n^2(2n+1)}+\frac{1}{8n^2(2n+1)^2}>1-\frac{1}{4n}+\frac{1}{4n^2}-\frac{1}{8n^2}=1-\frac{1}{4n}+\frac{1}{8n^2}.$$

Here we used the inequality $(2n+1)\geq 3$.

In a similar way we obtain the upper bound for $\big(1-\frac{1}{(2n+1)^2}\big)^n$:

$$\Big(1-\frac{1}{(2n+1)^2}\Big)^n<1-\frac{n}{(2n+1)^2}+\frac{n(n-1)}{2(2n+1)^4}=1-\frac{4n^2}{4n(2n+1)^2}+\frac{16n^4-16n^3}{32n^2(2n+1)^4}=$$
$$=1-\frac{1}{4n}+\frac{1}{4n^2}-\frac{3}{8n^2(2n+1)}+\frac{1}{8n^2(2n+1)^2}+\frac{(2n+1)^4-6(2n+1)^3+12(2n+1)^2-10(2n+1)+3}{32n^2(2n+1)^4}=$$
$$=1-\frac{1}{4n}+\frac{1}{4n^2}-\frac{3}{8n^2(2n+1)}+\frac{1}{8n^2(2n+1)^2}+\frac{1}{32n^2}-\frac{3}{16n^2(2n+1)}+\frac{3}{8n^2(2n+1)^2}-\frac{5}{16n^2(2n+1)^3}+\frac{3}{32n^2(2n+1)^4}=$$
$$=1-\frac{1}{4n}+\frac{9}{32n^2}-\frac{9}{16n^2(2n+1)}+\frac{1}{2n^2(2n+1)^2}-\frac{5}{16n^2(2n+1)^3}+\frac{3}{32n^2(2n+1)^4}<1-\frac{1}{4n}+\frac{9}{32n^2}.$$

3. To get the lower bound for the integral $\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}}(1-t^2)^n dt$ we apply Lemma 1(3) to the function $(1-t^2)^n$ and its integral:

$$\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}}(1-t^2)^n dt>\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}}(1-nt^2)dt=\frac{1}{2n+1}-\frac{n}{3(2n+1)^3}=\frac{8n^3}{8n^3(2n+1)}-\frac{16n^4}{48n^3(2n+1)^3}=$$
$$=\frac{(2n+1)^3-3(2n+1)^2+3(2n+1)-1}{8n^3(2n+1)}-\frac{(2n+1)^4-4(2n+1)^3+6(2n+1)^2-4(2n+1)+1}{48n^3(2n+1)^3}=$$
$$=\frac{(2n+1)^2-3(2n+1)+3}{8n^3}-\frac{1}{8n^3(2n+1)}-\frac{(2n+1-4)}{48n^3}-\frac{6}{48n^3(2n+1)}+\frac{4}{48n^3(2n+1)^2}-\frac{1}{48n^3(2n+1)^3}=$$
$$=\frac{4n^2-2n+1}{8n^3}-\frac{2n-3}{48n^3}-\frac{1}{4n^3(2n+1)}+\frac{4}{48n^3(2n+1)^2}-\frac{1}{48n^3(2n+1)^3}=$$
$$=\frac{1}{2n}-\frac{7}{24n^2}+\frac{5}{16n^3}-\frac{1}{4n^3(2n+1)}+\frac{1}{12n^3(2n+1)^2}-\frac{1}{48n^3(2n+1)^3}>$$
$$=\frac{1}{2n}-\frac{7}{24n^2}+\frac{5}{16n^3}-\frac{1}{4n^3(2n+1)}\geq\frac{1}{2n}-\frac{7}{24n^2}+\frac{5}{16n^3}-\frac{1}{12n^3}=\frac{1}{2n}-\frac{7}{24n^2}+\frac{11}{48n^3}.$$

□

An upper bound is a bit more difficult:

$$\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}} (1-t^2)^n dt < \int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}} (1-nt^2+\frac{n(n-1)}{2}t^4)dt = \frac{1}{2n+1} - \frac{n}{3(2n+1)^3} + \frac{n(n-1)}{10(2n+1)^5} =$$

$$= \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{7}{24n^2} + \frac{5}{16n^3} - \frac{1}{4n^3(2n+1)} + \frac{1}{12n^3(2n+1)^2} - \frac{1}{48n^3(2n+1)^3} + \frac{32n^5-32n^4}{320n^3(2n+1)^5} =$$

$$= \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{7}{24n^2} + \frac{5}{16n^3} - \frac{1}{4n^3(2n+1)} + \frac{1}{12n^3(2n+1)^2} - \frac{1}{48n^3(2n+1)^3} +$$

$$+ \frac{(2n+1)^5 - 7(2n+1)^4 + 18(2n+1)^3 - 22(2n+1)^2 + 13(2n+1) - 3}{320n^3(2n+1)^5} =$$

$$= \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{7}{24n^2} + \frac{101}{320n^3} - \frac{87}{320n^3(2n+1)} + \frac{134}{960n^3(2n+1)^2} - \frac{86}{980n^3(2n+1)^3}$$

$$+ \frac{13}{320n^3(2n+1)^4} - \frac{3}{320n^3(2n+1)^5} < \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{7}{24n^2} + \frac{120}{320n^3} = \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{7}{24n^2} + \frac{3}{8n^3}.$$

4. To get the lower bound for the integral $\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}} (1-t^2)^{n-1}dt$ we apply the bounds from Lemma 1(3) to the function $(1-t^2)^{n-1}$:

$$\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}} (1-t^2)^{n-1}dt > \int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}} (1-(n-1)t^2)dt = \frac{1}{2n+1} - \frac{n-1}{3(2n+1)^3} = \frac{8n^3}{8n^3(2n+1)} - \frac{16n^4-16n^3}{48n^3(2n+1)^3} =$$

$$= \frac{(2n+1)^3 - 3(2n+1)^2 + 3(2n+1) - 1}{8n^3(2n+1)} - \frac{(2n+1)^4 - 6(2n+1)^3 + 12(2n+1)^2 - 10(2n+1) + 3}{48n^3(2n+1)^3} =$$

$$= \frac{(2n{+}1)^2 - 3(2n{+}1) + 3}{8n^3} - \frac{1}{8n^3(2n{+}1)} - \frac{(2n{+}1{-}6)}{48n^3} - \frac{1}{4n^3(2n{+}1)} + \frac{5}{24n^3(2n{+}1)^2} - \frac{1}{16n^3(2n{+}1)^3} =$$

$$= \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{7}{24n^2} + \frac{11}{48n^3} - \frac{3}{8n^3(2n+1)} + \frac{5}{24n^3(2n+1)^2} - \frac{1}{16n^3(2n+1)^3} >$$

$$> \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{7}{24n^2} + \frac{11}{48n^3} - \frac{3}{8n^3(2n+1)} \geq \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{7}{24n^2} + \frac{11}{48n^3} - \frac{1}{8n^3} = \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{7}{24n^2} + \frac{5}{48n^3}.$$

An upper bound is a bit more difficult:

$$\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}} (1-t^2)^{n-1}dt < \int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}} (1-(n{-}1)t^2 + \frac{(n{-}1)(n{-}2)}{2}t^4)dt = \frac{1}{2n{+}1} - \frac{n-1}{3(2n{+}1)^3} + \frac{(n^2{-}3n{+}2)}{10(2n+1)^5} =$$

$$= \frac{8n^3}{8n^3(2n+1)} - \frac{16n^4-16n^3}{48n^3(2n+1)^3} + \frac{32n^5-96n^4+64n^3}{320n^3(2n+1)^5} =$$

$$= \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{7}{24n^2} + \frac{11}{48n^3} - \frac{3}{8n^3(2n+1)} + \frac{5}{24n^3(2n+1)^2} - \frac{1}{16n^3(2n+1)^3} +$$

$$+ \frac{(2n+1)^5 - 11(2n+1)^4 + 42(2n+1)^3 - 70(2n+1)^2 + 53(2n+1) - 15}{320n^3(2n+1)^5} =$$

$$= \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{7}{24n^2} + \frac{11}{48n^3} - \frac{3}{8n^3(2n+1)} + \frac{5}{24n^3(2n+1)^2} - \frac{1}{16n^3(2n+1)^3} +$$

$$+ \frac{1}{320n^3} - \frac{11}{320n^3(2n+1)} + \frac{42}{320n^3(2n+1)^2} - \frac{70}{320n^3(2n+1)^3} +$$

$$+ \frac{53}{320n^3(2n+1)^4} - \frac{15}{320n^3(2n+1)^5} < \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{7}{24n^2} + \frac{223}{960n^3} < \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{7}{24n^2} + \frac{1}{4n^3}.$$

8. EVALUATING THE CENTRAL BINOMIAL COEFFICIENTS

In this section we derive some lower and upper bounds for the central binomial coefficients $\binom{2n}{n} = \frac{(2n)!}{(n!)^2}$. We shall use the following refined version of the Stirling formula for factorials.

Lemma 3. *For every* $n \geq 1$

$$n! = \sqrt{2\pi n}\left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n e^{r_n}$$

where

$$\frac{1}{12n} - \frac{1}{2^6 3n^3} < r_n < \frac{1}{12n}.$$

Proof. The upper bound $r_n < \frac{1}{12n}$ is well-known and can be found in Robbins (1955). The lower bound for r_n will be derived from the lower bound

$$r_n > \frac{1}{12n + \frac{3}{2(2n+1)}}$$

proved by Maria (1965), and the lower bound for $\frac{1}{2n+1}$ from Lemma 2(1):

$$\begin{aligned} r_n &> \frac{1}{12n + \frac{3}{2(2n+1)}} = \frac{1}{12n} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{8n(2n+1)}} > \frac{1}{12n} \cdot \Big(1 - \frac{1}{8n(2n+1)}\Big) = \frac{1}{12n} - \frac{1}{2^5 3n^2(2n+1)} > \\ &> \frac{1}{12n} - \frac{1}{2^5 3n^2}\Big(\frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{4n^2} + \frac{1}{8n^3}\Big) = \frac{1}{12n} - \frac{1}{2^6 3n^3} + \frac{1}{2^7 3n^4} - \frac{1}{2^8 3n^5} > \frac{1}{12n} - \frac{1}{2^6 3n^3}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Using Lemma 3, we shall prove the following lower and upper bounds for the central binomial coefficients:

Lemma 4. *The lower and upper bounds*

$$\frac{4^n}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1 - \frac{1}{8n} + \frac{1}{64n^2}\Big) < \tbinom{2n}{n} < \frac{4^n}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1 - \frac{1}{8n} + \frac{1}{48n^2}\Big)$$

hold for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. By Lemma 3, we get

$$\tbinom{2n}{n} = \frac{4^n}{\sqrt{\pi n}} e^{r_{2n} - 2r_n}.$$

So, it suffices to prove the lower and upper bounds for $e^{r_{2n}-2r_n}$. Lemma 3 guarantees that

$$r_{2n} - 2r_n < \frac{1}{24n} - \frac{1}{6n} + \frac{1}{2^5 3n^3} = -\frac{1}{8n} + \frac{1}{2^5 3n^3} < 0.$$

Applying Lemma 1(1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} e^{r_{2n}-2r_n} &< 1 + (r_{2n} - 2r_n) + \frac{1}{2}(r_{2n} - 2r_n)^2 < 1 - \frac{1}{8n} + \frac{1}{2^5 3n^3} + \frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{1}{2^6 n^2} - \frac{1}{2^7 3n^4} + \frac{1}{2^{10} 3^2 n^6}\Big) = \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{8n} + \frac{1}{2^5 3n^3} + \frac{1}{2^7 n^2} - \frac{1}{2^8 3n^4} + \frac{1}{2^{11} 3^2 n^6} < 1 - \frac{1}{8n} + \frac{1}{2^7 n^2} + \frac{1}{2^5 3n^3} \le \\ &\le 1 - \frac{1}{8n} + \frac{7}{2^7 3n^2} < 1 - \frac{1}{8n} + \frac{1}{64n^2} \end{aligned}$$

which yields the required upper bound for $\binom{2n}{n}$.

On the other hand, Lemma 3 implies:

$$r_{2n} - 2r_n > \frac{1}{24n} - \frac{1}{2^9 3n^3} - \frac{2}{12n} = -\frac{1}{8n} - \frac{1}{2^9 3n^3}$$

and then we can apply the lower bound from Lemma 1(1) to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{r_{2n}-2r_n} &> e^{-\frac{1}{2^3 n} - \frac{1}{2^9 3n^3}} > 1 - \Big(\frac{1}{2^3 n} + \frac{1}{2^9 3n^3}\Big) + \frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{1}{2^3 n} + \frac{1}{2^9 3n^3}\Big)^2 - \frac{1}{6}\Big(\frac{1}{2^3 n} + \frac{1}{2^9 3n^3}\Big)^3 = \\ &= 1 - \Big(\frac{1}{2^3 n} + \frac{1}{2^9 3n^3}\Big) + \frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{1}{2^6 n^2} + \frac{2}{2^{12} 3n^4} + \frac{1}{2^{18} 3^2 n^6}\Big) - \frac{1}{6}\Big(\frac{1}{2^9 n^3} + \frac{3}{2^{15} 3n^5} + \frac{3}{2^{21} 3^3 n^7} + \frac{1}{2^{27} 3^3 n^9}\Big) = \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{2^3 n} - \frac{1}{2^9 3n^3} + \frac{1}{2^7 n^2} + \frac{1}{2^{12} 3n^4} + \frac{1}{2^{19} 3^2 n^6} - \frac{1}{2^{10} 3n^3} - \frac{1}{2^{16} 3n^5} - \frac{1}{2^{22} 3^3 n^7} - \frac{1}{2^{28} 3^4 n^9} = \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{2^3 n} + \frac{1}{2^7 n^2} - \frac{1}{2^{10} 1n^3} + \frac{1}{2^{12} 3n^4} + \frac{1}{2^{19} 3^2 n^6} - \frac{1}{2^{16} 3n^5} - \frac{1}{2^{22} 3^3 n^7} - \frac{1}{2^{28} 3^4 n^9} > \\ &> 1 - \frac{1}{2^3 n} + \frac{1}{2^7 n^2} - \frac{1}{2^{10} n^3} \ge 1 - \frac{1}{2^3 n} + \frac{1}{2^7 n^2} - \frac{1}{2^{10} 1n^2} > 1 - \frac{1}{2^3 n} + \frac{1}{2^6 n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

9. Proof of Theorem 3

Theorem 3 can be derived from Theorem 4 and Lemmas 2 and 3 by routine arithmetic calculations. This will be done in eight subsections corresponding to the parameters evaluated in Theorem 3. In fact, for $n = 1$, Theorem 3 can be proved using the data from Section 2.1. So, from now on we assume that $n \geq 2$.

9.1. **Evaluating the price X_0.** By Theorem 4(1),

$$X_0 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4^n}\tbinom{2n}{n}\Big(n\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}}(1-t^2)^{n-1}dt - \frac{1}{2}\Big(1 - \frac{1}{(2n+1)^2}\Big)^n\Big).$$

Using the upper bound from Lemma 2(4) and the lower bounds from Lemma 2(2) and 4, we get the required upper bound for X_0:

$$\begin{aligned} X_0 &< \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4^n}\tbinom{2n}{n}\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{7}{24n}+\frac{1}{4n^2}-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{8n}-\frac{1}{16n^2}\Big) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4^n}\tbinom{2n}{n}\Big(-\frac{1}{6n}+\frac{3}{16n^2}\Big) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{6n4^n}\tbinom{2n}{n}\Big(1 - \frac{9}{8n}\Big) < \\ &< \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{6n\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1 - \frac{1}{8n} + \frac{1}{2^6n^2}\Big)\cdot\Big(1 - \frac{9}{8n}\Big) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6n\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(-1 + \frac{1}{8n} - \frac{1}{2^6n^2} + \frac{9}{8n} - \frac{9}{2^6n^2} + \frac{9}{2^9n^3}\Big) < \\ &< \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6n\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(-1 + \frac{10}{8n}\Big) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(-\frac{1}{6n} + \frac{5}{24n^2}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Using the lower bound from Lemma 2(4) and the upper bounds from Lemma 2(2) and 4, we get the required lower bound for X_0:

$$\begin{aligned} X_0 &> \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4^n}\tbinom{2n}{n}\Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{7}{24n} + \frac{5}{48n^2} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{8n} - \frac{9}{64n^2}\Big) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4^n}\tbinom{2n}{n}\Big(-\frac{1}{6n} - \frac{7}{2^63n^2}\Big) = \\ &= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{6n4^n}\tbinom{2n}{n}\Big(1 + \frac{7}{2^5n}\Big) > \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{6n\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1 - \frac{1}{8n} + \frac{1}{2^43n^2}\Big)\cdot\Big(1 + \frac{7}{2^5n}\Big) = \\ &= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{6n\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1 + \frac{3}{2^5n} - \frac{5}{2^83n^2} + \frac{7}{2^93n^3}\Big) > \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{6n\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1 + \frac{3}{2^5n}\Big) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(-\frac{1}{6n} - \frac{1}{2^6n^2}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

9.2. **Evaluating the price X_1.** By Theorem 4(1),

$$X_1 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{n}{4^n}\tbinom{2n}{n}\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}}(1-t^2)^{n-1}dt.$$

Using the upper bounds from Lemmas 4 and 2(4), we get the required upper bound for X_1:

$$X_1 < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1-\frac{1}{8n}+\frac{1}{48n^2}\Big)\cdot\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{7}{24n}+\frac{1}{4n^2}\Big) < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{5}{16n}+\frac{57}{2^63n^2}\Big) < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{5}{16n}+\frac{1}{12n^2}\Big).$$

Using the lower bound from Lemmas 4 and 2(4), we get the required lower bound for X_1:

$$X_1 > \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1 - \frac{1}{8n} + \frac{1}{64n^2}\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{7}{24n} + \frac{5}{48n^2}\Big) > \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{5}{16n} + \frac{1}{48n^2}\Big).$$

9.3. **Evaluating the probability P_0.** By Theorem 4(2),

$$P_0 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{(2n+1)}{2^{2n+1}}\tbinom{2n}{n}\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}}(1-t^2)^n dt.$$

This formula and upper bounds from Lemmas 4 and 2(3) imply the upper bound for P_0:

$$\begin{aligned} P_0 &< \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2n{+}1}{2\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1-\frac{1}{8n}+\frac{1}{2^43n^2}\Big)\cdot\Big(\frac{1}{2n}-\frac{7}{24n^2}+\frac{3}{8n^3}\Big) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2n{+}1}{4n\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1-\frac{1}{8n}+\frac{1}{2^43n^2}\Big)\cdot\Big(1-\frac{7}{12n}+\frac{3}{4n^2}\Big) = \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2n{+}1}{4n\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1 - \frac{17}{24n} + \frac{27}{32n^2} - \frac{61}{2^63^2n^3} + \frac{1}{2^6n^4}\Big) < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2n{+}1}{4n\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1 - \frac{17}{24n} + \frac{27}{32n^2}\Big) = \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4n\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(2n - \frac{5}{12} + \frac{47}{48n} + \frac{27}{32n^2}\Big) \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4n\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(2n - \frac{5}{12} + \frac{47}{48n} + \frac{27}{64n}) < \\ &< \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4n\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(2n - \frac{5}{12} + \frac{3}{2n}\Big) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{5}{48n} + \frac{3}{8n^2}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

The lower bound can be derived by analogy:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_0 &> \frac{1}{2}+\frac{2n{+}1}{2\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1{-}\frac{1}{8n}{+}\frac{1}{2^6n^2}\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{2n}{-}\frac{7}{24n^2}{+}\frac{11}{48n^3}\Big)=\frac{1}{2}+\frac{2n{+}1}{4n\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1{-}\frac{1}{8n}{+}\frac{1}{2^6n^2}\Big)\Big(1{-}\frac{7}{12n}{+}\frac{11}{24n^2}\Big)=\\
&=\frac{1}{2}+\frac{2n+1}{4n\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1-\frac{17}{24n}+\frac{105}{2^63n^2}-\frac{17}{2^8n^3}+\frac{11}{2^93n^4}\Big)>\frac{1}{2}+\frac{(2n+1)}{4n\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1-\frac{17}{24n}+\frac{105}{2^63n^2}-\frac{17}{2^8n^2}\Big)>\\
&>\frac{1}{2}+\frac{2n+1}{4n\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1-\frac{17}{24n}+\frac{1}{2n^2}\Big)=\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{4n\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(2n-\frac{5}{12}+\frac{7}{24n}+\frac{1}{2n^2}\Big)>\\
&>\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{5}{48n}+\frac{6}{96n^2}\Big)=\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{5}{48n}+\frac{1}{16n^2}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Using this formula and Lemmas 2 and 3 we can derive the upper and lower bounds for P_0 from Theorem 3 as follows:

9.4. **Evaluating the probability P_1.** By Theorem 4(4),

$$P_1=\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2^{2n+1}}\binom{2n}{n}\Big(1-\frac{1}{(2n+1)^2}\Big)^n+\frac{n}{2^{2n}}\binom{2n}{n}\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n+1}}(1-t^2)^{n-1}dt.$$

Using the upper bound from Lemmas 2(2,4) and 4, we get the required upper bound for X_0:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_1 &< \frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{4^n}\binom{2n}{n}\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{8n}+\frac{9}{64n^2}+\frac{1}{2}-\frac{7}{24n}+\frac{1}{4n^2}\Big)<\\
&<\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1-\frac{1}{8n}+\frac{1}{48n^2}\Big)\Big(1-\frac{5}{12n}+\frac{25}{64n^2}\Big)<\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1-\frac{13}{24n}+\frac{1}{2n^2}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the lower bound from Lemmas 2(2,4) and 4, we get the required lower bound for X_1:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_1 &> \frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{4^n}\binom{2n}{n}\Big(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{8n}+\frac{1}{16n^2}+\frac{1}{2}-\frac{7}{24n}+\frac{5}{48n^2}\Big)>\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1-\frac{1}{8n}+\frac{1}{2^6n^2}\Big)\Big(1-\frac{5}{12n}+\frac{1}{6n^2}\Big)=\\
&=\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1-\frac{13}{24n}+\frac{15}{64n^2}-\frac{21}{2^83n^3}+\frac{1}{6n^2}\Big)>\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1-\frac{13}{24n}+\frac{3}{16n^2}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

9.5. **Evaluating the expected profit $\Pi_0=\Pi_1$.** By Theorem 4(3),

$$\Pi_0=\Pi_1=\frac{(n+1)}{2^{2n}}\binom{2n}{n}\Big(1-\frac{1}{(2n+1)^2}\Big)^n.$$

Substituting to this formula the upper and lower bounds from Lemmas 3 and 2(2), we get the upper and lower bounds for Π_0:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_0=\Pi_1 &< \frac{(n+1)}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1-\frac{1}{8n}+\frac{1}{2^43n^2}\Big)\Big(1-\frac{1}{4n}+\frac{9}{32n^2}\Big)=\frac{(n+1)}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1-\frac{3}{8n}+\frac{1}{3n^2}-\frac{39}{2^83n^3}+\frac{3}{2^9n^4}\Big)<\\
&<\frac{(n+1)}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1-\frac{3}{8n}+\frac{1}{3n^2}\Big)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(n+\frac{5}{8}-\frac{1}{24n}+\frac{1}{3n^2}\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_0=\Pi_1 &> \frac{n+1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1{-}\frac{1}{8n}{+}\frac{1}{2^6n^2}\Big)\Big(1{-}\frac{1}{4n}{+}\frac{1}{8n^2}\Big)=\frac{n+1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1{-}\frac{3}{8n}{+}\frac{11}{2^6n^2}{-}\frac{5}{2^8n^3}{+}\frac{1}{2^9n^4}\Big)>\\
&>\frac{n+1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(1{-}\frac{3}{8n}{+}\frac{11}{2^6n^2}{-}\frac{5}{2^8n^3}\Big)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(n{+}\frac{5}{8}{-}\frac{13}{2^6n}{+}\frac{39}{2^8n^2}{-}\frac{5}{2^8n^3}\Big)>\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(n{+}\frac{5}{8}{-}\frac{13}{2^6n}\Big)>\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n}}\Big(n{+}\frac{5}{8}{-}\frac{1}{4n}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

T.BANAKH: IVAN FRANKO NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF LVIV, UKRAINE, AND JAN KOCHANOWSKI UNIVERSITY, KIELCE, POLAND
E-mail address: `t.o.banakh@gmail.com`

P.TRISCH: AALTO UNIVERSITY, PL21220, 00076, AALTO, FINLAND, AND NATIONAL UNIVERSITY "OSTROH ACADEMY", 2, SEMINAR ST., OSTROH, RIVNE OBLAST, 35800, UKRAINE
E-mail address: `p.trisch.wp07@wharton.upenn.edu`